DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 636 UD 017 139

AUTHOR	Hopkins, Thomas F.
TITLE	Graphics Expression System Reading Center, Evaluation Period 1975-76.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	16p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63405
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Audio Equipment; Audiovisual Programs; Failure Factors; Grade 7; Grade 8; *Graphic Arts; Intermediate Grades; *Junior High Schools; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Reading Centers; Reading Improvement; *Reading Skills; Self Concept; Success Factors; *Video Equipment
IDENTIFIERS	*Graphics Expression Reading Improvement System; *New York (Bronx)

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the Graphics Expression System Reading Center Program, which provided students with limited learning motivation and with below norm achievement in reading, as well as those students reading on and above grade level with the opportunity to use the compact recording studio equipment in the production of television shows. The purpose of this program was to improve student motivation and interest, and to provide individualization of diagnostic techniques and learning activities through increased acquisition of, and achievement in, basic skills and reading comprehension. The students worked individually or in small groups under the direct supervision of a teacher. They were involved in a wide variety of activities associated with production of a graphic expression system audiotype, videotape, etc. The instrument used to collect achievement information was teacher-made and criterion-referenced. Findings indicate that there were 68 participating seventh graders, and 29 participating eighth graders. Only 57.3% of the seventh grade students attained a passing score in the criterion-referenced test. The evaluation objective specified that at least 60% attain the passing score. Seventy-two point four percent of the eighth grade students attained a passing score on the teacher-made criterion-referenced test. The criterion that at least 60% should attain the passing score was achieved by this group. The major problem affecting this program's functioning was the unavailability of the specific equipment which formed the essential hardware of the program. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED142636

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 20-63405

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GRAPHICS EXPRESSION SYSTEM READING CENTER

Evaluation Period
1975-1976

prepared by:

Thomas F. Hopkins, Ph.D.

An evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs Funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year.

UD017139

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

		page
Chapter I	The Program	1
	Program Description	1
	Selection of Participants	2
	Program Modifications	3
Chapter II	Evaluation Procedures	4
	Program Objectives and Instrumentation	4
Chapter III	Findings	8
	Discrepancy Analysis	9
	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	11
Appendix	Teacher-Made Test	12

THE PROGRAM

The Graphics Expression System Reading Center Program was funded in Community School District #9 involving schools CIS 148 and CJHS 145. The starting and ending dates were January 5, 1976 and June 30, 1976.

The following description was summarized from the original project proposal:

Program Description

The Graphics Expression System Reading Center Program funds two complete Graphics Expression Systems, which include a three camera television mini-studio, housed in two intermediate schools. This program provides students with limited learning motivation and below norm achievement in reading as well as those students reading on and above grade level, with the opportunity to utilize the compact recording studio equipment in the production of television shows and thereby improve student motivation and interest, provide individualization of diagnostic techniques and learning activities through increased acquisition of, and achievement in, basic skills and reading comprehension.

The students working individually, or in small groups under the direct supervision of the program teacher and/or teacher aide will be involved in a wide variety of activities associated with production of a graphics expression system audiotape, videotape, etc., including:

a) audiotaping stories,
b) reading stories in preparation for production planning and script writing,

c) writing plans required for production and script writing,
d) discussing production and script plans,
e) planning and writing scripts,
f) using the listening centers,
g) carrying out designated and selected skill work activities,
h) listening to the oral reading of scripts,
i) sharing ideas and reactions to plans and scripts,
j) directly involved in the audio or video taping of a script,
k) learning through reading, writing, listening and participation, of the different components of the graphics expression system, their care and use, etc.

The program will also be used to improve communication skills with adult workshops, including parents, paraprofessional staff, etc.

The following description of the selection of participants was also taken from the original project proposal:

Selection of Participants

The target population is approximately 360 children in the seventh and eighth grades in CJHS 145 and CIS 148, Bronx. From among this identified target population, which includes students on and above grade level achievement in reading as well as students who require remedial reading assistance, 360 children from the seventh and eighth grades will be selected who demonstrate a particular need for this program by the fact that:

a) having scored on or above grade level in reading achievement on the April, 1975, Citywide Reading and Math test, they would benefit from the opportunity to participate in a program providing enhanced intellectual, cognitive and reading comprehension motivation, stimulation and achievement opportunities.

b) their reading scores fall one year or more below the norm as measured by the April, 1975, Citywide Reading

and Mathematics test scores.

Additional criteria for the selection of this identified target population of seventh and eighth grade students in CJHS 145 and CIS 148, include selections and recommendations made by the classroom teacher and supervisory staff, based on teacher prepared tests, and the pupil's cumulative record when the need for intellectual cognitive opportunities as well as developmental, remedial compensatory instruction is indicated.

Where none of the above is available, the Stanford Achievement test results, or other designated appropriate test results, may be used as the eligibility criteria for selection.

Program Modifications

A number of program modifications should be brought to the reader's attention at this time to facilitate understanding of the report; however, a more complete discussion is contained in the discrepancy analysis (see FINDINGS). The equipment ordered for this program has not arrived as of this date. The program began at CIS 148 with a borrowed video tape monitor on March 31, 1976. Due to the unavailability of equipment, the program was not initiated at CJHS 145. Reading scores were not available for CIS 148 students; therefore, students were selected for participation in the program on the basis of the language arts supervisor's judgment.

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The following section presents the program objectives as originally submitted in the evaluation design. In addition, modifications in the objectives were made twice, and all have been included for the record.

Program Objectives

1. The participating seventh grade students who participate in 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program will improve significantly in reading achievement as measured by the pre-post administration of the New York City Reading Tests. The 1975 and 1976 Testing Programs will constitute the pretest and posttest. Individual pupil scores will be adjusted by the historical regression formula.
2. The participating eighth grade students who particpate in 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program will improve significantly in reading achievement as measured by the pre-post administration of the New York City Reading Tests. The 1975 Testing Program will constitute the pre-test, while the 1976 Testing Program will constitute the posttest. Individual pupil scores will be adjusted by the historical regression formula.
3. The "intellectually gifted" participating children in the seventh and eighth grades, who participate in 60% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program will demonstrate substantial intellectual and cognitive growth, as measured by the pre-post administration of the New York City Reading Tests. The 1975 Testing Program will constitute the pretest, while the 1976 Testing Program will constitute the posttest. Individual pupil scores will be adjusted

by the historical regression formula..

4. The self-image of 80% of the program participants will be maintained or improved as measured by the pre-post administration of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale.

5. The program, as actually implemented, will coincide with the program as described in the proposal and any subsequent modifications or addenda.

Addendum

1. The first objective has been modified to read that the participating seventh grade students who are present for both pretest and posttest will improve significantly in reading achievement as measured by the administration of Stanford Achievement Test. Note that the pretest score will be obtained in the regular 1976 New York City Testing Program. A special administration of the 1973 edition of Stanford Achievement Test will constitute the posttest. Individual pupil scores will be adjusted by the historical regression formula.

2. The second objective has been modified to read that the participating eighth grade students who are present for both pretest and posttest will improve significantly in reading achievement as measured by the administration of Stanford Achievement Test. Note that the pretest score will be obtained in the regular 1976 New York City Testing Program. A special administration of the 1973 edition of Stanford Achievement Test will constitute the posttest. Individual pupil scores will be adjusted by the historical regression formula.

3. The third objective has been modified to read that the participating "intellectually gifted" students in the seventh and eighth grades who are present for both pretest and post-test will improve significantly in reading achievement as measured by the administration of Stanford Achievment Test. Note that the pretest score will be obtained in the regular 1976 New York City Testing Program. A special administration of the 1973 edition of Stanford Achievement Test will constitute the posttest. Individual pupil scores will be adjusted by the historical regression formula.

Second Addendum

1. The first objective is now modified to read that 60% of the participating seventh grade students will attain a passing score of 80% correct on a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument measuring specific content of the graphics expression program.

2. The second objective is now modified to read that 60% of the participating eighth grade students will attain a passing score of 80% correct on a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument measuring specific content of the graphics expression program.

3. The third objective is now modified to read that 60% of the participating "intellectually gifted" students in the seventh and eighth grades will attain a passing score of 80% correct on a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument measuring specific content of the graphics expression program.

Additional Information

The instrument used to collect achievement information is teacher-made and criterion-referenced (see attachment). Data were collected the week of May 10, 1976. The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale was pretested on April 1, 1976; April 2, 1976; and April 5, 1976 and posttested the week of May 10, 1976. All participating students, who were present, were tested.

FINDINGS

Each of the final evaluation objectives and relevant results follow:

1. The first objective was modified to read that 60% of the participating seventh grade students will attain a passing score of 80% correct on a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument measuring specific content of the graphics expression program.

There were 68 participating seventh graders. In terms of the objective, 39 or 57.3% attained a passing score of 80% correct on the teacher-made, criterion-referenced test (see attachment). Note that the evaluation objective specifies at least 60% should attain the passing score.

2. The second objective was modified to read that 60% of the participating eighth grade students will attain a passing score of 80% correct on a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument measuring specific content of the graphics expression program.

There were 29 participating eighth graders. In terms of the objective, 21 or 72.4% attained a passing score on the teacher-made, criterion-referenced test. The criterion that at least 60% should attain the passing score has been achieved by this group.

3. The third objective is now modified to read that 60% of the participating "intellectually gifted" students in the seventh and eighth grades will attain a passing score of 80% correct on a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument measuring specific content of the graphics expression program.

There were 48 participating "intellectually gifted" eighth graders. The passing score on the teacher-made test was attained by 43 or 89.6%. The objective was obviously attained by this group.

4. The self-image of 80% of the program participants will be maintained or improved as measured by the pre-post administration of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale.

Although 360 seventh and eighth graders were targeted for the program in the two schools, only the 137 seventh and eighth graders at CIS 148 were tested. Using stanines, 113 or 82.5% maintained or improved their self-images. This objective was achieved in the program.

5. The program, as actually implemented, will coincide with the program as described in the proposal and any subsequent modifications or addenda.

As a reading of the discrepancy analysis will document, this objective was not met in the program. The unavailability of equipment seriously impaired the operation and evaluation of the program. Observations at CIS 148 revealed that the Program Coordinator was making a valiant attempt to implement the program with borrowed equipment. The evaluation data reported for the preceding objectives strongly suggest that he was succeeding in his efforts.

Facilities

The classes were conducted in the school library at CIS 148, which was an adequate setting for this program as implemented. Pupils sat at tables in groups of five (5). There was ample space among the tables and the visibility of the video tape monitor was good from all seating positions.

Discrepancy Analysis

The major discrepancy affecting this program's functioning and this evaluation is the unavailability of the specific equipment which forms the essential hardware of the Graphics Expression System Reading Center Program. This discrepancy affected all aspects of the program. The program began on March 31, 1976 with a borrowed video tape monitor at CIS 148. This delay and shortened treatment time seriously constrained the evaluation process. Note that the program was partially implemented at CJHS 145 due to the lack of equipment. All in all, for a program of this type, the unavailability of the funded equipment seriously impeded both program operation and program evaluation.

Another discrepancy involved the lack of reading scores (April, 1975 New York City Reading Test) for the participating seventh and eighth grade students. These scores were not entered on the students' records and were not available for selection decisions. The language arts supervisor at CIS 148 made the judgment regarding participation of the seventh graders, eighth graders, and "intellectually gifted". Note that the date of the program's inception also constrained implementation of the original selection design.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the fact that the program as actually implemented did not coincide with the original program description, the data collected surprisingly revealed that the other program objectives were met in most instances. Note that the program was in operation for only a short period. Using a teacher-made, criterion-referenced instrument which assessed the specialized vocabulary and content of the program, the objective was clearly met for the participating eighth graders and the "intellectually gifted" students. The objective was nearly met for the participating seventh graders (57.3%). The objective regarding maintenance or improvement of self-image was met for participating students.

It would appear that the program did function successfully at CIS 148 with borrowed equipment. The classroom observations of this evaluator also support the conclusion that learning was taking place and that the unique aspects of the program were implemented in a modified fashion.

A recommendation is herein made that the program be continued next year. In view of the discrepancy analysis and the obtained results, the program does hold great promise. The strongest recommendation possible is made that equipment for this program be available from its beginning. This program cannot be properly evaluated unless this recommendation is followed.

NAME _____ CLASS TEACHER _____

CLASS _____ DATE _____

Directions: Read each question carefully and circle what you think to be the best answer.

1. If the cameraman is moving the video picture in and out, he is

   a) zooming b) tilting c) cutting d) wiping

2. Before we write a video script, we must

   a) do research b) evaluate the tape c) pick a topic d) record a final tape

3. When we are taping our video productions, we read aloud into a

   a) kinescope b) microphone c) vidicon d) track

4. To keep a camera steady while taping we can use a

   a) pan b) tripod c) monitor d) zoom

5. A list of the people taking part in a production is called

   a) the graphics b) the credits c) the close-up d) the zoom

6. An audio tape recorder records

   a) a picture and sound b) just a picture c) just sound d) whatever you would like

7. The name of the special TV set used with a video tape recorder is a

   a) monitor b) zoom ring c) fade-out d) SEG

NAME _____ CLASS _____

8. The tube in a video camera that is very expensive and records the image is the

a) radio tube b) tilt tube c) vidicon tube d) transformer

9. On a video camera you find a

a) zoom ring b) trigger c) lens d) all of the above

10. The person speaking in front of the camera is the

a) talent b) director c) cue card holder d) camera person

11. When you are a video camera person you should

a) hold the camera steady b) look directly into the view finder

c) focus the zoom carefully d) all of the above

12. Which statement is true about video tape?

a) Videotape can be used over and over again.

b) You can see little pictures on the videotape when you look at it.

c) Videotape is the same as film.

d) Videotape has to be developed after you record on it.

13. In the production of a good video tape, the talent should

a) look down at the paper b) read the script quickly

c) keep moving the microphone d) speak clearly and loudly

14. Graphics can be

a) photographs b) drawings c) magazine pictures d) all of the above